arXiv:0707.1361v1 [math.AC] 10 Jul 2007

A generalization of the Shestakov-Umirbaev inequality

Shigeru Kuroda

1 Introduction

Let k be a field, and $k[\mathbf{x}] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring in n variables over k for $n \in \mathbf{N}$. For a polynomial $\Phi = \sum_{i=0}^{l} \phi_i y^i$ in a variable y over $k[\mathbf{x}]$ and $g \in k[\mathbf{x}]$, we denote $\Phi(g) = \sum_{i=0}^{l} \phi_i g^i$, where $\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_l \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $l \geq 0$. Then, it follows that

$$\deg^g \Phi := \max\{\deg(\phi_i g^i) \mid i = 0, \ldots, l\} \geq \deg \Phi(g)$$

in general. Here, $\deg f$ denotes the total degree of f for each $f \in k[\mathbf{x}]$. Shestakov-Umirbaev [6, Theorem 3] proved an inequality which describes the difference between $\deg^g \Phi$ and $\deg \Phi(g)$. Using this result, they settled in [7] an important open problem on automorphisms of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ as follows.

Let $\sigma : k[\mathbf{x}] \to k[\mathbf{x}]$ be a homomorphism of k-algebras. Then, σ is an isomorphism if and only if

$$k[\sigma(x_1), \ldots, \sigma(x_n)] = k[\mathbf{x}]. \tag{1.1}$$

For example, σ is an isomorphism if there exist $(a_{i,j})_{i,j} \in GL_n(k)$ and $(b_i)_i \in k^n$ such that $\sigma(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j} x_j + b_i$ for each i. It also follows that σ is an isomorphism if there exists $l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\sigma(x_i) = x_i$ for each $i \neq l$ and $\sigma(x_l) = \alpha x_l + f$ for some $\alpha \in k^{\times}$ and $f \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_{l-1}, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_n]$. An automorphism of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ as in the former example is said to be *affine*, and one as in the latter example is said to be *elementary*. Because an invertible matrix is expressed as a product of elementary matrices, each affine automorphism can be obtained by the composition of elementary automorphisms. Then, a problem arises whether the automorphism group $\operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$ can be generated by elementary automorphisms. This is called the *Tame Generators Problem*. If $n = 1$, then every automorphism of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ is in fact elementary. If $n = 2$, then $\operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$ is generated by elementary automorphisms, which was shown by Jung [2] in 1942 in case k is of characteristic zero, and by van der Kulk [3] in 1953 for an arbitrary k. We note that this result is a consequence of the following characterization of automorphisms of $k[\mathbf{x}]$.

Proposition 1.1 *If* $n = 2$*, then either* $\deg \sigma(x_1) | \deg \sigma(x_2)$ *or* $\deg \sigma(x_2) | \deg \sigma(x_1)$ *holds for each* $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$.

Here, $a|b$ denotes that b is divisible by a for each $a, b \in \mathbf{N}$. Due to (1.1), $\deg \sigma(x_i)$ must be positive for each $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

When $n \geq 3$, the problem becomes extremely difficult. In 1972, Nagata [4] conjectured that the automorphism $\tau \in \operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $n = 3$ defined by

$$\tau(x_1) = x_1 - 2(x_1x_3 + x_2^2)x_2 - (x_1x_3 + x_2^2)^2 x_3,\ \tau(x_2) = x_2 + (x_1x_3 + x_2^2)x_3,\ \tau(x_3) = x_3$$

cannot be obtained by the composition of elementary automorphisms of $k[\mathbf{x}]$. This conjecture was well-known, but was not settled for a long time. In 2004, however, Shestakov-Umirbaev [7] finally showed that the Nagata conjecture is true if k is of characteristic zero. The inequality mentioned at the beginning plays a crucial role in their solution of the Nagata conjecture. The Tame Generators Problem is thus settled for $n = 3$, but remains open for $n \geq 4$. We note that the extension $\tilde{\tau} \in \operatorname{Aut}_k k[\mathbf{x}]$ of the Nagata automorphism τ for $n \geq 4$ defined by $\tilde{\tau}(x_i) = \tau(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\tilde{\tau}(x_i) = x_i$ for $i = 4, \ldots, n$ is a composite of elementary automorphisms (see [5]).

The argument in [7] is indeed difficult, but employs no advanced facts other than those in [6]. Therefore, the results in [6] are of great importance. However, its argument is also difficult, and, consequently, the proof of this landmark work of Shestakov-Umirbaev is unfortunately not widely understood.

The purpose of the present paper is to generalize the results of [6]. Our argument is quite simple and elementary, but the results are general and very interesting. These results will be useful not only for a better understanding of the theory of Shestakov-Umirbaev, but also to generalize it to higher dimensions to solve the Tame Generators Problem for $n \geq 4$. As an application, we give a generalization of Proposition 1.1 in Theorem 4.3.

Section 2 is devoted to proving a basic result. We derive its consequence in Section 3, and apply it to characterizations of automorphisms of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ in Section 4. In Section 5, we generalize a lemma [6, Lemma 5] of Shestakov-Umirbaev which also plays an important role in the solution of the Nagata conjecture.

It should be noted that Makar-Limanov [1] also gave another proof of [6, Theorem 3] in a different fashion.

2 Differentials

In what follows, we always assume that k is of characteristic zero. First, we introduce some terminology concerning the grading of a polynomial ring.

Let Γ be a totally ordered additive group, and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ an element of Γ^n. We define the $\mathbf{w}$-*weighted grading* $k[\mathbf{x}] = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Gamma} k[\mathbf{x}]_\gamma$ by setting $k[\mathbf{x}]_\gamma$ to be the k-vector space generated by $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}$ for $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i w_i = \gamma$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Here, $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the set of nonnegative integers, and $l\gamma$ denotes the sum of l copies of γ for each $l \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. It follows that $k[\mathbf{x}]_\gamma k[\mathbf{x}]_\mu \subset k[\mathbf{x}]_{\gamma+\mu}$ for each $\gamma, \mu \in \Gamma$. Assume that $f = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} f_\gamma$ is an element of $k[\mathbf{x}]$, where $f_\gamma \in k[\mathbf{x}]_\gamma$ for each γ. If $f \neq 0$, then the $\mathbf{w}$-*degree* $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f$ of f is defined to be the maximum among $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $f_\gamma \neq 0$. If $f = 0$, then we set $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f = -\infty$, i.e., a symbol which is less than each element of Γ. The addition is defined by $(-\infty) + \gamma = \gamma + (-\infty) = -\infty$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma \cup \{-\infty\}$, and the sum of l copies of $-\infty$ is denoted by $l(-\infty)$ for each $l \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We say that f is $\mathbf{w}$-*homogeneous* if $f = f_\gamma$ for some γ. In case $f \neq 0$, we define $f^{\mathbf{w}} = f_\delta$, where $\delta = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f$. Then, it follows that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f^{\mathbf{w}} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f$, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f - f^{\mathbf{w}}) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f$, and $(f_1 f_2)^{\mathbf{w}} = f_1^{\mathbf{w}} f_2^{\mathbf{w}}$ for each $f, f_1, f_2 \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$. We denote by $\Gamma_{\geq 0}$ the set of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma \geq 0$, where 0 is the zero of the additive group Γ. We remark that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f \geq 0$ holds for each $f \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ whenever $\mathbf{w}$ is an element of $(\Gamma_{\geq 0})^n$. If $\Gamma = \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{w} = (1, \ldots, 1)$, then the $\mathbf{w}$-degree is the same as the total degree.

Now, for $\Phi \in k[\mathbf{x}][y]$ and $g \in k[\mathbf{x}]$, we define

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi = \max\{\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi_i g^i) \mid i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}\}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\phi_i \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each $i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $\Phi = \sum_i \phi_i y^i$. Then, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$ is at least $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g)$ in general. The purpose of this section is to prove an inequality which describes the difference between $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g)$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$.

Let $\partial_y^i \Phi$ denote the i-th order derivative of Φ in y for each $i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $\deg_y \Phi$ the degree of Φ in y. Obviously, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \partial_y^i \Phi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \big(\partial_y^i \Phi\big)(g)$ if $i \geq \deg_y \Phi$. So, we may consider the nonnegative integer

$$m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi) = \min\left\{i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \partial_y^i \Phi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \big(\partial_y^i \Phi\big)(g)\right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that

$$m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi) = m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\partial_y \Phi) + 1 \quad \text{ and } \quad \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \partial_y \Phi + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g \tag{2.3}$$

if $m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi) \geq 1$ and $g \neq 0$, where $\partial_y \Phi = \partial_y^1 \Phi$, since k is of characteristic zero.

Let $\Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ be the differential module of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ over k, and $\bigwedge^r \Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ the r-th exterior power of the $k[\mathbf{x}]$-module $\Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ for $r \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then, each $\omega \in \bigwedge^r \Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ is uniquely expressed as

$$\omega = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n} f_{i_1, \ldots, i_r} dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_r},$$

where $f_{i_1, \ldots, i_r} \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each $i_1, \ldots, i_r$. Here, df denotes the differential of f for each $f \in k[\mathbf{x}]$. We define the $\mathbf{w}$-degree of ω by

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega = \max\{\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_1, \ldots, i_r}) + w_{i_1} + \cdots + w_{i_r} \mid 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Since $df = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\partial f / \partial x_i) dx_i$ and k is of characteristic zero, the equality

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} df = \max\left\{\deg_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}\right) + w_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\right\} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f \tag{2.5}$$

holds for each $f \in k[\mathbf{x}]$. It is easily verified that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega + \omega') \leq \max\{\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega'\}$,

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge \eta) \leq \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta \quad \text{ and } \quad \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f\omega) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega \tag{2.6}$$

for each $\omega, \omega' \in \bigwedge^r \Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ and $\eta \in \bigwedge^s \Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ for $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with $r + s \leq n$, and $f \in k[\mathbf{x}]$.

In the notation above, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ be elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $r \geq 1$ which are algebraically independent over k, and set $\omega = df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_r$. Then, the inequality*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi + m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)(\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g) \tag{2.7}$$

holds for each $\Phi \in k[f_1, \ldots, f_r][y] \setminus \{0\}$, $g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$.

Proof. Recall that, for $h_1, \ldots, h_s \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $s \geq 1$, it follows that $h_1, \ldots, h_s$ are algebraically independent over k if and only if $dh_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dh_s \neq 0$ when k is of characteristic zero. Therefore, $\omega \wedge df_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, while $\omega \neq 0$ by assumption. By chain rule, we may write $d(\Phi(g)) = (\partial_y \Phi)(g)dg + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \psi_i df_i$, where $\psi_i \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each i. Thus,

$$\omega \wedge d(\Phi(g)) = (\partial_y \Phi)(g)\omega \wedge dg + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \psi_i \omega \wedge df_i = (\partial_y \Phi)(g)\omega \wedge dg. \tag{2.8}$$

By (2.5), (2.6) and (2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) &= \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} d(\Phi(g)) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge d(\Phi(g))) \\ &= \deg_{\mathbf{w}}((\partial_y \Phi)(g)\omega \wedge dg) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\partial_y \Phi)(g) + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

By adding $-\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega$ to both sides of (2.9), we get

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\partial_y \Phi)(g) + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega. \tag{2.10}$$

Now, we show (2.7) by induction on $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi)$. If $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) = 0$, then $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi$ by the definition of $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi)$. In this case, (2.7) is clear. Assume that $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) \geq 1$. Then, $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\partial_y \Phi)$ is less than $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi)$ by (2.3). By induction assumption, and by the equalities in (2.3), we obtain

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\partial_y \Phi)(g) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \partial_y \Phi + m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\partial_y \Phi)M = (\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g) + (m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) - 1)M, \tag{2.11}$$

where $M = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$. Using (2.10) and (2.11), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) &\geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\partial_y \Phi)(g) + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega \\ &\geq (\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g) + (m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) - 1)M + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega \\ &= \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi + m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi)(\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the inequality (2.7) is true. □

3 The Shestakov-Umirbaev inequality

In this section, we derive some consequences of Theorem 2.1.

First, we remark that the element $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi$ of Γ defined as in (2.1) is equal to the $(\mathbf{w}, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)$-degree of Φ for each $\Phi \in k[\mathbf{x}][y] \setminus \{0\}$, $g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma$, where we regard Φ as a polynomial in the $n+1$ variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and y over k. We denote $\Phi^{(\mathbf{w}, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)}$ by $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$, for short.

Lemma 3.1 *Let* $\Phi \in k[\mathbf{x}][y] \setminus \{0\}$, $g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma$.

(i) *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) = 0$.

(2) $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \Phi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g)$.

(3) $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$.

(4) $\Phi(g) \neq 0$ *and* $\Phi(g)^{\mathbf{w}} = \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}})$.

(ii) *It follows that* $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) = \min\{i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (\partial_y^i(\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}))(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0\}$.

Proof. (i) The equivalence between (1) and (2) immediately follows from the definition of $m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)$. In the following, we will establish that

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi(g) - \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}})) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi. \tag{3.1}$$

Assuming this, we can readily check that (2), (3) and (4) are equivalent, since

$$\Phi(g) = \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) + (\Phi(g) - \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}})),$$

and $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}})$ is contained in $k[\mathbf{x}]_{\delta}$, where $\delta = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$.

Write $\Phi = \sum_i \phi_i y^i$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = \sum_i \phi_i' y^i$, where $\phi_i, \phi_i' \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each i. Then, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi_i g^i) \leq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$ for each i. Note that $\phi_i' = \phi_i^{\mathbf{w}}$ if $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi_i g^i) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$, and $\phi_i' = 0$ otherwise. We have

$$\phi_i g^i - \phi_i'(g^{\mathbf{w}})^i = \phi_i g^i - \phi_i^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}})^i = \phi_i g^i - (\phi_i g^i)^{\mathbf{w}}$$

in the former case, and $\phi_i g^i - \phi_i'(g^{\mathbf{w}})^i = \phi_i g^i$ in the latter case. In each case, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$ is greater than the $\mathbf{w}$-degree of $\phi_i g^i - \phi_i'(g^{\mathbf{w}})^i$, and hence greater than that of

$$\sum_i \left(\phi_i g^i - \phi_i'(g^{\mathbf{w}})^i\right) = \Phi(g) - \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}}).$$

Thus, we obtain (3.1), thereby proving that (2), (3) and (4) are equivalent.

(ii) Observe that $\left(\partial_y^i \Phi\right)^{\mathbf{w},g} = \partial_y^i(\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g})$ for each $i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. In view of this equality, it follows that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \partial_y^i \Phi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\partial_y^i \Phi\right)(g)$ if and only if $\left(\partial_y^i(\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g})\right)(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$ by the equivalence between (2) and (3) in (i). Then, the assertion immediately follows from the definition of $m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)$. $\square$

Now, let A be a k-subalgebra of $k[\mathbf{x}]$, and K the field of fractions of A. We define the *initial algebra* $A^{\mathbf{w}}$ of A for $\mathbf{w}$ to be the k-subalgebra of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ generated by $f^{\mathbf{w}}$ for $f \in A \setminus \{0\}$. Then, $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$ belongs to $A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \setminus \{0\}$ for each $\Phi \in A[y] \setminus \{0\}$ for any $g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$. We claim that the field of fractions of $B^{\mathbf{w}}$ is equal to that of $A^{\mathbf{w}}$ whenever B is a k-subalgebra of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ whose field of fractions is equal to K. Indeed, if $fg_1 = g_2$ for $f \in A$ (resp. $f \in B$) and $g_1, g_2 \in B$ (resp. $g_1, g_2 \in A$), then we have $f^{\mathbf{w}} g_1^{\mathbf{w}} = (fg_1)^{\mathbf{w}} = g_2^{\mathbf{w}}$, so $f^{\mathbf{w}}$ belongs to the field of fractions of $B^{\mathbf{w}}$ (resp. $A^{\mathbf{w}}$). For this reason, we denote the field of fractions of $A^{\mathbf{w}}$ by $K^{\mathbf{w}}$.

For an integral domain R and an element s of an integral domain S containing R, we define $I(R,s)$ to be the kernel of the substitution map $R[y] \ni f \mapsto f(s) \in S$. When $I(R,s)$ is a principal ideal of $R[y]$, a generator of $I(R,s)$, which is unique up to multiplication by units in R, is denoted by $P(R,s)$. We remark that $I(R,s)$ is always principal if R is a unique factorization domain. If R is a field and s is algebraic over R, then we may take $P(R,s)$ to be the minimal polynomial of s over R.

Proposition 3.2 *Let A be a k-subalgebra of $k[\mathbf{x}]$, and K the field of fractions of A. Then, for each $\Phi \in A[y] \setminus \{0\}$, $g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$, we have the following:*

(i) *If $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is transcendental over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$, then $m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi) = 0$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$.*

(ii) *If $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is algebraic over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$, then $m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)$ is at most the quotient of $\deg_y \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$ divided by $[K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}]$. If furthermore $I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ is a principal ideal, then there exists $H \in A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \setminus I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ such that $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = P(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})^m H$, where $m = m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)$.*

Proof. (i) If $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is transcendental over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$, then $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$, since $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$ is a nonzero element of $K^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$. Hence, $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi) = 0$ and $\deg \Phi(g) = \deg^g \Phi$ by Lemma 3.1(i).

(ii) Set $P_0 = P(K^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$, $P = P(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ and $I = I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$. By Lemma 3.1(ii), we have $(\partial_y^{m-1}\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g})(g^{\mathbf{w}}) = 0$ and $(\partial_y^{m}\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g})(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$. Since k is of characteristic zero, this implies that $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = P_0^m H$ for some $H \in K^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$ with $H(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$. By the assumption that $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is algebraic over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$, it follows that $\deg_y P_0 = [K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Thus, we get $\deg_y \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)[K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}] + \deg_y H$. Therefore, $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)$ is at most the quotient of $\deg_y \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$ divided by $[K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Assume that I is a principal ideal. Write $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = P^{m'}H'$, where $m' \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $H' \in A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \setminus I$. Then, m' must be at most m, since P belongs to $P_0K^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$. On the other hand, P does not belong to $P_0^2K^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$, for otherwise $\partial_y P$ would belong to $P_0K^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \cap A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] = I = PA^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$, a contradiction. Hence, m' must be at least m, since $H'(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \neq 0$. Thus, $m' = m$. This proves the latter part. □

Here is a generalization of the Shestakov-Umirbaev inequality [6, Theorem 3].

Theorem 3.3 *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ and g be nonzero elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $r \geq 1$ with $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ algebraically independent over k, and let $A = k[f_1, \ldots, f_r]$, $K = k(f_1, \ldots, f_r)$ and $\omega = df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_r$. Let $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$ such that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} h \geq 0$ for each $h \in A \setminus \{0\}$, and $M = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$. Then, we have the following for each $\Phi \in A[y] \setminus \{0\}$:*

(i) *Assume that $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is algebraic over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$, and let a and b be the quotient and residue of $\deg_y \Phi$ divided by $[K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}]$, respectively. Then, it follows that*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq (\deg_y \Phi) \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g + aM = a([K^{\mathbf{w}}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : K^{\mathbf{w}}] \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g + M) + b \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g. \tag{3.2}$$

(ii) *If $I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ is a principal ideal and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g \geq 0$, then*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)(\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} P(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}}) + M). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. (i) The equality in (3.2) can be checked easily. We only show the inequality. By Theorem 2.1, we get $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi + m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)M$. It suffices to verify that $\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi \geq (\deg_y \Phi) \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$ and $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)M \geq qM$. Let $\phi_e \in A$ be the coefficient of y^e in Φ, where $e = \deg_y \Phi$. Then, $\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi_e g^e)$. Besides, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \phi_e \geq 0$ by the assumption on $\mathbf{w}$. Hence, we get

$$\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\phi_e g^e) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \phi_e + e \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g \geq (\deg_y \Phi) \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g.$$

On the other hand, we obtain $M \leq 0$ using (2.5) and (2.6). Moreover, $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi) \leq a$ by Proposition 3.2(ii). Therefore, $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)M \geq aM$, proving the inequality in (3.2).

(ii) We note that $\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Psi \geq 0$ whenever Ψ is a nonzero element of $A[y] \cup A^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$. Actually, $\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Psi = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \psi + l \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$ for some $\psi \in A \setminus \{0\}$ and $l \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \psi \geq 0$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g \geq 0$ by assumption. First, assume that $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is transcendental over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$. Then, $m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}) = 0$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) = \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi$ by Proposition 3.2(i). Hence, the right-hand side of (3.3) is zero, while $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi(g)) \geq 0$, since $\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi \geq 0$ as noted. Therefore, (3.3) is true if $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is transcendental over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$. Next, assume that $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ is algebraic over $K^{\mathbf{w}}$. By Proposition 3.2(ii), we get $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = P^m H$ for some $H \in A^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$, where $P = P(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ and $m = m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi)$. Since $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} H \geq 0$ as noted, we obtain

$$\deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi = \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi^{\mathbf{w},g} = m \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} P + \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} H \geq m^g_{\mathbf{w}}(\Phi) \deg^g_{\mathbf{w}} P.$$

With the aid of this inequality, (3.3) follows from Theorem 2.1. □

The following lemma is well-known. For the sake of completeness, we include a proof at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.4 *Let* f *and* g *be* $\mathbf{w}$*-homogeneous elements of* $k[\mathbf{x}]$ *with* $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f > 0$ *and* $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g > 0$ *for some* $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$*. If* f *and* g *are algebraically dependent over* k*, then there exist mutually prime natural numbers* $l(f,g)$ *and* $l(g,f)$ *as follows:*

(i) $g^{l(f,g)} = \alpha f^{l(g,f)}$ *for some* $\alpha \in k$.

(ii) $I(k[f], g) = \big(y^{l(f,g)} - \alpha f^{l(g,f)}\big) k[f][y]$.

(iii) $[k(f)(g) : k(f)] = l(f,g)$.

(iv) $l(f,g) = (\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f) \gcd(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)^{-1}$ *if* $\Gamma = \mathbf{Z}$.

The Shestakov-Umirbaev inequality [6, Theorem 3] is obtained as a corollary to Theorem 3.3.

Corollary 3.5 (Shestakov-Umirbaev) *Assume that* $f, g \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus k$ *satisfy* $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f > 0$ *and* $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g > 0$ *for some* $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{Z}^n$*. Then, for each* $\Phi \in k[f][y] \setminus \{0\}$*, it follows that*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq a(\operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g) + M) + b \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g \tag{3.4}$$

where $M = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$*, and* a *and* b *are the quotient and residue of* $\deg_y \Phi$ *divided by* $(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f) \gcd(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)^{-1}$*, respectively.*

Proof. We remark that $k[f]^{\mathbf{w}} = k[f^{\mathbf{w}}]$, and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} h \geq 0$ for each $h \in k[f] \setminus \{0\}$. In fact, if $h = \sum_{i=0}^{e} c_i f^i$, where $c_0, \ldots, c_e \in k$ with $c_e \neq 0$ for $e \geq 0$, then $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} h = e \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f \geq 0$ and $h^{\mathbf{w}} = c_e (f^{\mathbf{w}})^e$, since $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f > 0$ by assumption. Consequently, we have $k(f)^{\mathbf{w}} = k(f^{\mathbf{w}})$. First, assume that $f^{\mathbf{w}}$ and $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically dependent over k, and put $N = [k(f^{\mathbf{w}})(g^{\mathbf{w}}) : k(f^{\mathbf{w}})]$. Then, Theorem 3.3(i) gives that

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq a'(N \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g + M) + b' \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g, \tag{3.5}$$

where a' and b' are the quotient and residue of $\deg_y \Phi$ divided by N, respectively. By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$N = \frac{\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f^{\mathbf{w}}}{\gcd(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f^{\mathbf{w}}, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g^{\mathbf{w}})} = \frac{\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f}{\gcd(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)} = \frac{\operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g)}{\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g}.$$

This implies that the right-hand side of (3.5) is equal to that of (3.4). Therefore, (3.4) is true. If $f^{\mathbf{w}}$ and $g^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k, then $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi$ by Proposition 3.2(i). As in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we get $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} \Phi \geq (\deg_y \Phi) \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$. On the other hand, the right-hand side of (3.4) is equal to $(\deg_y \Phi) \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g + aM$, and also $M \leq 0$. This proves (3.4). $\square$

In the original statement of [6, Theorem 3], the "Poisson bracket" $[f, g]$ is used instead of $df \wedge dg$. The degrees of $[f, g]$ and $df \wedge dg$ are defined in the same way.

To conclude this section, we prove Lemma 3.4. The assertions (ii), (iii) and (iv) easily follows from the assertion (i). We only show that there exist mutually prime natural numbers l and m such that $f^{-m} g^l$ belongs to k. Without loss of generality, we may assume that k is algebraically closed. In fact, $f^{-m}g^l$ necessarily belongs to k if $f^{-m}g^l$ is algebraic over k, since the field of fractions of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ is a regular extension of k.

By the assumption that f and g are algebraically dependent over k, we may find a nontrivial algebraic relation $\sum_{i,j}\beta_{i,j}f^ig^j = 0$, where $\beta_{i,j} \in k$ for each $i, j \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let J be the set of $(i,j) \in (\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0})^2$ such that $\beta_{i,j} \neq 0$, and (i_0, j_0) and (i_1, j_1) the elements of J such that $i_0 \leq i \leq i_1$ for each $i \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $(i,j) \in J$ for some j. Since f and g are $\mathbf{w}$-homogeneous, we may assume that $i \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f + j \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$ are the same for any $(i,j) \in J$. Then, $(i_1 - i_0)\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g = (j_0 - j_1)\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f$. We note that $i_1 - i_0$ must be positive, for otherwise $J = \{(i_0, j_0)\}$, and then $0 = \sum_{(i,j)\in J}\beta_{i,j}f^ig^j = \beta_{i_0,j_0}f^{i_0}g^{j_0} \neq 0$, a contradiction. Since $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f > 0$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} g > 0$ by assumption, we get $j_0 - j_1 > 0$. Set $l' = i_1 - i_0$, $m' = j_0 - j_1$ and $l = l'/e$, $m = m'/e$, where $e = \gcd(l', m')$. Then, J is contained in the set of $(i_0, j_0) + p(l, -m)$ for $p = 0, \ldots, e$. By putting $\beta'_p = \beta_{i_0+lp, j_0-mp}$ for each p, we get

$$0 = \sum_{(i,j)\in J}\beta_{i,j}f^ig^j = f^{j_0}g^{i_0}\sum_{p=0}^{e}\beta'_p(f^{-m}g^l)^p = \beta'_e f^{j_0}g^{i_0}\prod_{p=1}^{e}(f^{-m}g^l - \alpha_p),$$

where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_e \in k$ are the solutions of the algebraic equation $\sum_{p=0}^{e}\beta'_p y^p = 0$ in y. Thus, $f^{-m}g^l = \alpha_p$ for some p. Therefore, $f^{-m}g^l$ is contained in k. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4.

4 A characterization of polynomial automorphisms

As an application of our result, we study features of elements of $\mathrm{Aut}_k\, k[\mathbf{x}]$. Namely, we give a characterization of n-tuples $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ of elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n] = k[\mathbf{x}]$.

First, we recall a basic fact about initial algebras.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ be elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $r \geq 0$. If $g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k for $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$, then $k[g_1, \ldots, g_r]^{\mathbf{w}} = k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$.*

Proof. Clearly, $k[g_1, \ldots, g_r]^{\mathbf{w}}$ contains $k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$. We show the reverse inclusion by induction on r. The assertion is obvious if $r = 0$. Assume that $r \geq 1$. It suffices to verify that $h^{\mathbf{w}}$ belongs to $k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$ for each $h \in k[g_1, \ldots, g_r] \setminus \{0\}$. Take $H \in A[y]$ such that $h = H(g_r)$, where $A = k[g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1}]$. By induction assumption, we have $A^{\mathbf{w}} = k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_{r-1}^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Besides, $H^{\mathbf{w}, g_r}$ belongs to $A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \setminus \{0\}$. Hence, $H^{\mathbf{w}, g_r}(g_r^{\mathbf{w}})$ is contained in $k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Moreover, $H^{\mathbf{w}, g_r}(g_r^{\mathbf{w}})$ is not zero, since $g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k by assumption. Hence, $H(g_r)^{\mathbf{w}} = H^{\mathbf{w}, g_r}(g_r^{\mathbf{w}})$ by Lemma 3.1(i). Since $h = H(g_r)$, we get $h^{\mathbf{w}} = H(g_r)^{\mathbf{w}}$. Thus, $h^{\mathbf{w}}$ belongs to $k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Therefore, $k[g_1, \ldots, g_r]^{\mathbf{w}}$ is contained in $k[g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, g_r^{\mathbf{w}}]$. □

The following proposition is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.1.

Proposition 4.2 *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n] = k[\mathbf{x}]$. Then, $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k if and only if $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}] = k[\mathbf{x}]$ for $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$.*

Proof. The "if" part is clear, for $k[\mathbf{x}]$ has transcendence degree n over k. Assume that $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k. Then, $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}] = k[f_1, \ldots, f_n]^{\mathbf{w}}$ by Lemma 4.1. Since $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n] = k[\mathbf{x}]$, we have $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n]^{\mathbf{w}} = k[\mathbf{x}]^{\mathbf{w}} = k[\mathbf{x}]$. Thus, $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}] = k[\mathbf{x}]$. This proves the "only if" part. $\square$

Next, we consider the case where $k(f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}})$ has transcendence degree $n-1$ over k for some $\mathbf{w} \in \Gamma^n$. We define an element $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$ of Γ as follows: Let $\lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} : k[\mathbf{x}] \to k[\mathbf{x}]$ be the homomorphism defined by $\lambda(x_i) = f_i^{\mathbf{w}}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then, $\ker \lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$ is a prime ideal of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ of hight one. Since $k[\mathbf{x}]$ is a unique factorization domain, there exists $Q \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\ker \lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = Qk[\mathbf{x}]$. We define $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$ to be the $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{f}}$-degree of Q, where

$$\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{f}} = (\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1, \ldots, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_n).$$

Note that $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$ is uniquely determined by $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{w}$, since Q is unique up to multiplication by elements in $k \setminus \{0\}$.

Here is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.3 *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be elements of $k[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n] = k[\mathbf{x}]$, and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ an element of $(\Gamma_{\geq 0})^n$. If $k(f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}})$ has transcendence degree $n-1$ over k, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i - \max\{w_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$.

Proof. Since $k(f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}})$ has transcendence degree $n-1$ over k, we may find l such that x_l is not contained in $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Moreover, we may assume that $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_{n-1}^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k by changing the indices of $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ if necessary. Set $A = k[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}]$ and $g = f_n$. Then, there exists $\Phi \in A[y]$ such that $\Phi(g) = x_l$, since $A[g] = k[\mathbf{x}]$ by assumption. Furthermore, $A^{\mathbf{w}} = k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_{n-1}^{\mathbf{w}}]$ by Lemma 4.1, and so $A^{\mathbf{w}}$ is a polynomial ring over k. Accordingly, $I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$ is a principal ideal of $A^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$. Besides, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} h \geq 0$ holds for each $h \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus \{0\}$, since $w_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ by assumption. Then, we can easily check that $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$, g and $\mathbf{w}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.3(ii). Therefore, we obtain

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g) \geq m_{\mathbf{w}}^{g}(\Phi)(\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{g} P + M), \tag{4.2}$$

where $P = P(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}})$, $\omega = df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_{n-1}$ and $M = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega - \deg_{\mathbf{w}} g$. We show that

$$M \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that $\omega \wedge dg = df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n = \alpha dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n$, where α is the determinant of the n by n matrix $(\partial f_i / \partial x_j)_{i,j}$. The assumption $k[f_1, \ldots, f_n] = k[\mathbf{x}]$ implies that α belongs to $k \setminus \{0\}$. Hence, we have

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\omega \wedge dg) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\alpha dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i. \tag{4.4}$$

On the other hand, we get

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \omega = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_{n-1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} df_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i \tag{4.5}$$

by using (2.5) and (2.6). Since $g = f_n$, the inequality (4.3) follows from (4.4) and (4.5).

To complete the proof, it remains only to show that $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) \geq 1$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g P = \Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$. Actually, assuming this, we can easily deduce (4.1) from the inequalities (4.2), (4.3) and

$$\max\{w_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\} \geq w_l = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} x_l = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \Phi(g).$$

First, suppose to the contrary that $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) = 0$. Then, $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}}) = \Phi(g)^{\mathbf{w}} = x_l^{\mathbf{w}} = x_l$ by Lemma 3.1. Recall that x_l does not belong to $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}]$, while $k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_n^{\mathbf{w}}] = A^{\mathbf{w}}[g^{\mathbf{w}}]$. Since $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}$ is in $A^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$, it follows that $\Phi^{\mathbf{w},g}(g^{\mathbf{w}})$ belongs to $A^{\mathbf{w}}[g^{\mathbf{w}}]$. This is a contradiction. Thus, we get $m_{\mathbf{w}}^g(\Phi) \geq 1$. Next, take $Q \in k[\mathbf{x}]$ so that $\ker \lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = Qk[\mathbf{x}]$. Let $\iota : k[\mathbf{x}] \to A^{\mathbf{w}}[y]$ be the homomorphism defined by $\iota(x_i) = f_i^{\mathbf{w}}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and $\iota(x_n) = y$. Then, ι is an isomorphism, since we are assuming that $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}, \ldots, f_{n-1}^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically independent over k. This assumption implies further that the $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{f}}$-degree of Q is equal to the $(\mathbf{w}, \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g)$-degree of $\iota(Q)$. It is equal to $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \iota(Q)$ as mentioned at the beginning of Section 3. Thus, we get $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \iota(Q)$. By definition, $\lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}$ is equal to the composite of ι and the substitution map $A^{\mathbf{w}}[y] \ni \psi \mapsto \psi(g^{\mathbf{w}}) \in k[\mathbf{x}]$. Hence, we have

$$\iota(Qk[\mathbf{x}]) = \iota(\ker \lambda_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}}) = I(A^{\mathbf{w}}, g^{\mathbf{w}}) = PA^{\mathbf{w}}[y].$$

Since ι is an isomorphism, $\iota(Q) = \alpha P$ for some $\alpha \in k \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g \iota(Q) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g P$. Therefore, we obtain $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^g P$. □

Theorem 4.3 is considered as a generalization of Proposition 1.1. In fact, we have the following corollary in case $n = 2$.

Corollary 4.4 *Assume that $f_1, f_2 \in k[x_1, x_2]$ satisfy $k[f_1, f_2] = k[x_1, x_2]$. If $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}$ and $f_2^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically dependent over k for $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0})^2$, then $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2$ are positive integers which satisfy*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1 + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2 \geq \operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2) + \min\{w_1, w_2\}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2)$. In particular, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1 | \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2$ or $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2 | \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1$.

Proof. Since $w_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ by assumption, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. We show that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ by contradiction. Suppose the contrary, say $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1 = 0$. Then, $w_i = 0$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, since f_1 cannot be contained in k. We claim that $\mathbf{w} \neq 0$, for otherwise $f_i^{\mathbf{w}} = f_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. This is impossible, because $k[f_1, f_2] = k[x_1, x_2]$, whereas $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}$ and $f_2^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically dependent over k. Hence, we have $w_j > 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\} \setminus \{i\}$. Since we suppose that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1 = 0$, this implies that f_1 belongs to $k[x_i]$, and besides $f_1^{\mathbf{w}} = f_1$. Then, $f_2^{\mathbf{w}}$ also belongs to $k[x_i]$, since $f_1^{\mathbf{w}}$ and $f_2^{\mathbf{w}}$ are algebraically dependent over k. Consequently, f_2 belongs to $k[x_i]$ due to the conditions $w_i = 0$ and $w_j > 0$. Thus, $k[f_1, f_2]$ is contained in $k[x_i]$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Put $P = P(k[f_1^{\mathbf{w}}], f_2^{\mathbf{w}})$ and $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2)$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we have $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{f_2} P$. By Lemma 3.4, we may write $P = \beta\bigl(y^{l(f_1,f_2)} - \alpha(f_1^{\mathbf{w}})^{l(f_2,f_1)}\bigr)$, where $\alpha, \beta \in k \setminus \{0\}$. Then, we have $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}^{f_2} P = \operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2)$. Thus, $\Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2)$. By Theorem 4.3, we obtain

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1 + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2 \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{w}} + w_1 + w_2 - \max\{w_1, w_2\} = \operatorname{lcm}(\deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_1, \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_2) + \min\{w_1, w_2\}$$

The last statement is a consequence of the first statement, since $a + b \geq \operatorname{lcm}(a, b)$ implies $a|b$ or $b|a$ for each $a, b \in \mathbf{N}$. $\square$

5 A lemma of Shestakov-Umirbaev

For $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in k[\mathbf{x}] \setminus k$, we put

$$m_1 = \deg f_1 + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_2 \wedge df_3),\ m_2 = \deg f_2 + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_3 \wedge df_1),\ m_3 = \deg f_3 + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_1 \wedge df_2),$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (1, \ldots, 1)$. Shestakov-Umirbaev [6, Lemma 5] proved the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1 (Shestakov-Umirbaev) *In the notation above, $m_1 \leq \max\{m_2, m_3\}$. If $m_2 \neq m_3$, then $m_1 = \max\{m_2, m_3\}$.*

This lemma also plays an important role in [7] to solve the Nagata conjecture. We note that the statement of Lemma 5.1 is equivalent to the following statement:
(†) There exist $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq 3$ such that $m_{i_1} = m_{i_2} \geq m_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.
To conclude this paper, we give a generalization of the lemma of Shestakov-Umirbaev.

Theorem 5.2 *Let $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_l$ be elements of $\Omega_{k[\mathbf{x}]/k}$ for $l \geq 2$. Then, there exist $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq l$ such that*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_{i_1} + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_{i_1} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_{i_2} + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_{i_2} \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_i + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_i$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, l$, where $\tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta_{i-1} \wedge \eta_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta_l$ for each i.

The statement (†) is obtained as a special case of Theorem 5.2 where $l = 3$ and $\eta_i = df_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, since

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_i + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_i = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} df_i + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_j \wedge df_k) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_i + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(df_j \wedge df_k) = m_i$$

for each distinct integers $1 \leq i, j, k \leq 3$ in this case.

Let us prove Theorem 5.2 by contradiction. Suppose to the contrary that there exists i_0 such that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_{i_0} + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_{i_0} > \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_i + \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_i$ for each $i \neq i_0$. Write $\eta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_{i,j} x_j^{-1} dx_j$ for each i, where $f_{i,j} \in x_j k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each j. Set $d\mathbf{x}_I = dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_{l-1}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_I = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{l-1}}$ for each $i_1, \ldots, i_{l-1}$, where $I = (i_1, \ldots, i_{l-1})$. Then, we may write $\tilde{\eta}_i = \sum_J \tilde{f}_{i,J} (\mathbf{x}_J)^{-1} d\mathbf{x}_J$, where the sum is taken over $J = (j_1, \ldots, j_{l-1})$ with $1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_{l-1} \leq n$, and $\tilde{f}_{i,J} \in \mathbf{x}_J k[\mathbf{x}]$ for each J. By the definition (2.4) of the $\mathbf{w}$-degree, there exist j_0 and J_0 such that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \eta_{i_0} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} f_{i_0,j_0}$ and $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{\eta}_{i_0} = \deg_{\mathbf{w}} \tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0}$. By the choice of i_0, it follows that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i,j} \tilde{f}_{i,J}) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_0,j_0} \tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0})$ for each j and J if $i \neq i_0$. In particular, $f_{i_0,j_0} \neq 0$ and $\tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0} \neq 0$. By changing the indices of $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_l$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if necessary, we may assume that $i_0 \neq 1$ and $J_0 = (1, \ldots, l-1)$. Note that the (i, l)-cofactor of the l by l matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} f_{1,1} & \cdots & f_{1,l-1} & f_{1,j_0} \\ f_{2,1} & \cdots & f_{2,l-1} & f_{2,j_0} \\ & \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdot & & \\ f_{l,1} & \cdots & f_{l,l-1} & f_{l,j_0} \end{pmatrix}$$

is equal to $(-1)^{l+i}\tilde{f}_{i,J_0}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Hence, $\det M = \sum_{i=1}^{l}(-1)^i f_{i,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i,J_0}$. Since $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i,J_0}) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_0,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0})$ if $i \neq i_0$, we get $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\det M) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_0,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0})$. On the other hand, the $(1, u)$-cofactor of M is equal to $(-1)^u\tilde{f}_{1,J_u}$ for $u = 1, \ldots, l$, where $J_u = (1, \ldots, u-1, u+1, \ldots, l-1, j_0)$ for $1 \leq u < l$ and $J_l = J_0$. Hence, $\det M = \sum_{u=1}^{l}(-1)^u f_{1,u}\tilde{f}_{1,J_u}$. Since we assume that $i_0 \neq 1$, it follows that $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{1,u}\tilde{f}_{1,J_u}) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_0,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0})$ for each u. Thus, $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\det M) < \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f_{i_0,j_0}\tilde{f}_{i_0,J_0})$, and we are led to a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.2.

References

[1] A. van den Essen, L. Makar-Limanov, and R. Willems, Remarks on Shestakov-Umirbaev, Report 0414, Radboud University of Nijmegen, Toernooiveld, 6525 ED Nijmegen, The Netherlands, 2004.

[2] H. Jung, Über ganze birationale Transformationen der Ebene, J. Reine Angew. Math. **184** (1942), 161–174.

[3] W. van der Kulk, On polynomial rings in two variables, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (3) **1** (1953), 33–41.

[4] M. Nagata, On Automorphism Group of $k[x, y]$, Lectures in Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Vol. 5, Kinokuniya Book-Store Co. Ltd., Tokyo, 1972.

[5] M. K. Smith, Stably tame automorphisms, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **58** (1989), 209–212.

[6] I. Shestakov and U. Umirbaev, Poisson brackets and two-generated subalgebras of rings of polynomials, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (2004), 181–196.

[7] I. Shestakov and U. Umirbaev, The tame and the wild automorphisms of polynomial rings in three variables, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (2004), 197–227.

Department of Mathematics and Information Sciences
Tokyo Metropolitan University
1-1 Minami-Ohsawa, Hachioji
Tokyo 192-0397, Japan
E-mail: `kuroda@tmu.ac.jp`